



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : **Confirmation No. 5690**  
Hirohisa IMAI et al. : Attorney Docket No. 2002\_0110A  
Serial No. 10/058,732 : Group Art Unit 3626  
Filed January 30, 2002 : Examiner Lena Najarian  
  
COMMUNICATION SYSTEM FOR : **Mail Stop RCE**  
INFORMATION OF MEDICAL  
DOCTOR'S QUESTIONS TO PATIENTS,  
TERMINAL APPARATUS FOR  
MEDICAL DOCTOR AND TERMINAL  
APPARATUS FOR PATIENT

---

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.133(b), the Applicants make of record the personal interview conducted in the above-identified application. A personal interview was conducted at the United States Patent and Trademark Office between Examiner Najarian of art unit 3626 and the Applicants' representative on March 18, 2008.

During the interview, the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 25 (i.e., as exemplary independent claims), and the cited prior art were discussed in detail. Additionally, the arguments presented in the request for reconsideration filed on December 19, 2007 were also discussed.

The Applicants' representative noted that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of the "template storing means" and the "generating means" of claim 1. Specifically, it was noted that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest the following features of claim 1:

“template storing means for storing template question programs which correspond to predetermined answer forms and are not dependent on a particular patient; and

generating means for generating question programs which are dependent on a particular patient among a plurality of patients, by inserting question sets received from said database server apparatus into the template question programs,

wherein the patient dependent question programs are not transmitted through the communication network.”

The Applicants’ representative also noted that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of the “reviewing and entry means” of claim 25.

Specifically, it was noted that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest the following features of claim 25.

“reviewing and entry means for reviewing the displayed answer data together with the displayed remedy policy which was entered previously for the patient based on a selection via the selection means, and additionally entering a new remedy policy for the patient based on the displayed answer data and the displayed remedy policy for the patient which was entered previously, whereby the doctor performs a medical examination for the patient via the communication system.”

At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner indicated that the further consideration would be given to the present invention based on the arguments presented during the interview, and the arguments presented in the request for reconsideration filed on December 19, 2007. The Examiner also indicated that further search and consideration would be necessary before making a final determination regarding the allowability of the claims.

Based on the results of the personal interview, the Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of the arguments presented in the request for reconsideration filed on December 19, 2007, and withdrawal of the rejections in the Office Action dated November 14, 2007.

If the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hirohisa IMAI et al.

By:

  
Mark D. Pratt

Registration No. 45,794  
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/DMO/led  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
March 20, 2008